

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is in response to the Office Action dated October 5, 2007. Claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended. Claims 1-17 are pending for further examination. A Request for Continued Examination is being filed concurrently herewith.

All claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Cretzler (U.S. Patent No. 5,644,724) in view of Golden et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,872). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Each of independent claims 1, 9, and 17 recite “wherein the transaction data further includes a transaction number, the transaction number enabling the consumer to confirm with the state agency whether the transaction has been properly reported.” By way of example and without limitation, a transaction number 57 is shown visually in the example customer receipt of Fig. 2, and the above-quoted feature of claims 1, 9, and 17 is described at pages 24-25 of the original specification.

Neither Cretzler nor Golden, nor the alleged combination thereof, teach or suggest at least the above-quoted feature of independent claims 1, 9, and 17. Both Cretzler and Golden are silent regarding the transmission of transaction data that includes, *inter alia*, a transaction number, with the transaction number enabling the consumer to confirm with the state agency whether the transaction has been properly reported. Even the alleged combination of Cretzler and Golden is silent regarding this feature of the independent claims.

Furthermore, both Cretzler and Golden actually teach away from this feature, since both Cretzler and Golden are directed to taking control and monitoring responsibilities away from retailers and offloading such responsibilities to their respective automated systems. Moreover, neither Cretzler nor Golden, nor their alleged combination, would contemplate enabling

FRANCISCO
Appl. No. 09/195,105
September 4, 2008

consumers to confirm with state agencies whether the transaction has been properly reported via a transaction number. Thus, neither Cretzler nor Golden, nor the alleged combination thereof, renders obvious claims 1, 9, and 17.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding Section 103 rejection are respectfully requested.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that all rejections be withdrawn and the application passed to issue. If any minor matter remains to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with regard to the same.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYTE P.C.

By: 

Joseph A. Rhoa
Reg. No. 37,515

JAR:jr
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100